

Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting

Registries Meeting

Tuesday 16 July 2013 at 09:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jul>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Man: This is an audio timestamp for the stream and record. This is the GTLD Registry Stakeholder Group meeting in Hall 3B scheduled to begin at 9:00 a.m. All record and streams are now live.

((Crosstalk))

Cherie Stubbs: If everyone would like to take a seat we are ready to start.

Good morning everybody. Thank you for joining the Registry Stakeholder Group Meeting. This is Cherie Stubbs. I am the secretary for the registry. Before we start, just a reminder when speaking to please announce your name and affiliation for purposes of the recording, the transcript and those who will be participating remotely. As of right now we have no one on remote participation but there will be. Oh we do.

((Crosstalk))

Cherie Stubbs: So we do.

I beg your pardon, we have Carolyn Hoover from dot Coop, Barbara Knight from VeriSign and Cary Karp from MuseDoma. Well good. We have got a lot of people.

So with that being said, Keith, would you like to start introductions of the Registry Stakeholder Group Officers and we would like all Registry Stakeholder Group Members to just briefly introduce themselves. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: This is Keith Drazek. Welcome everybody to the GTLD Registry Stakeholder Meeting of July 16, 2013 in Durban, South Africa. So we will go around and make introductions of the Registry Stakeholder Group Reps and also the NTAG Executive Committee and we will go ahead and get started.

So this is Keith Drazek, VeriSign and Chair.

Paul Diaz: Paul Diaz from Public Interest Registry and Vice-Chair.

Jeff Neuman: Jeff Neuman with Neustar, (GNSO) Council Rep.

Jonathan Robinson: Jonathan Robinson, (Affilias) Council Rep and Council Chair.

(Liz Finberg): Liz Finberg, PIR.

Man: (unintelligible) ICANN.

(Wendy Profit): Wendy Profit, ICANN

(Josh Vetlan): Josh Vetlan, Dot construction.

(Liz Sweezey): (Liz Sweezey), (unintelligible) Partners.

(Sara): Sara Falvey, CRR.

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer, Dot Green, NTAG Chair, (unintelligible) International (unintelligible) Registry.

Adrian Kinderis: (Adrian Kinderis, International Main Registry.

Man: Amadeu Abril i Abril CORE, an observer that should move to full member one of these days.

Keith Drazek: I think today.

Amadeu: I don't know.

Reg Levy: Reg Levy , Minds and Machines.

Statton Hammock: Statton Hammock, United TLD.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes, VeriSign.

Roy Dykes: Roy Dykes, Neustar.

(Judy): Judy Song-Marshall, Neustar.

Man: (unintelligible)

Man: (unintelligible).

Ernest Weinstein: Ernest Weinstein, ICANN Staff.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks everyone. Is there anyone else in the room that would like to introduce themselves as a Registry Stakeholder Group member or NTAG Executive Committee.

Ken Stubbs: Ken Stubbs, Afilias.

Michael Palage: Mike Palage, DotCoop.

Francisco Arias: Francisco Arias, ICANN Staff.

Cyrus : Cyrus Namazi, ICANN Staff

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks everybody and welcome. Welcome again and we should acknowledge and welcome Cyrus and Francisco joining us here. We will just get through a couple of administrative points before getting right into the agenda with ICANN staff.

First and I think this is a special day as far as an opportunity for the Registry Stakeholder Group Meeting - the Registry Stakeholder Group to welcome new members. With the signing of new GTLD Registry Agreements we have the pleasure today of welcoming ARI Core and Donuts - sorry, International Domain Registry, CORE, and Donuts, as full members. Typically, we will have a sort of process where new members will need to fill out another form to provide additional information and we will make sure that that form is distributed to the three of you as well as any new future members. So we are going to provide an interim, an exception, but welcome you all as full members today. So welcome.

As far as voting, we do have a provision in our charter that says a voting member in the Registry Stakeholder Group cannot be a voting member in another stakeholder group or constituency and so to the extent that someone is going to vote or wants to participate in any voting we need to make sure that there is a declaration that the organization does not participate in voting in other stakeholder groups or constituencies.

Jeff, do you want to touch on that?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. The organization or any of its affiliates and that is designed pretty much the same way as it is defined in the registry agreements and the NTAG does not count as another constituency or stakeholder group. There may be issues when you go to the NTAG meeting though if you vote here, but that is not one that you need to declare.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jeff. And not putting anyone on the spot here right now but it is just something that we will need to clarify. So Adrian and then Amadeu.

Adrian Amidao: As you International Domain Registry, am I able to declare that verbally or is that something you want in writing?

Keith Drazek: It is something that we will require in writing once the form is provided to you.

Adrian Amidao: Okay.

Keith Drazek: It is something you can do verbally today.

Adrian Amidao: So we have no other voting rights in the other stakeholder group and we will be a voting member of the Registry Stakeholder Group. We being the International Domain Registry. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Adrian.

Amadeu: Amadeu Abril I Abril, CORE registrar. We are in the process of creating a new separate entity but in the meantime we will not participate in any vote until we get all this resolved.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much, Amadaeu.

(John): Donuts and its affiliates do not vote in any other stakeholder group or constituents.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks John.

Okay thanks. So I think we have taken care of the administrative business that we need to at the beginning of the meeting. Cherie, is there anything else that we need to touch on before we move to the full agenda with ICANN staff.

Cherie Stubbs: No, I think we are fine. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks Cherie. Okay. So with that let's go ahead and move to our conversation with ICANN staff. Most of it is on the new gTLD program. No surprise. So, Cyrus and Francisco, welcome again and thank you for, you know, making time to meet with us. We have got a very full agenda as you can see from the information that I sent you previously and also that is on the agenda on the screen. So why don't we just get right into it?

We have got three primary issues that are sort of buckets of discussion and I am going to look to my fellow stakeholder group members and folks in the audience and certainly welcome NTAG members to participate fully in these conversations. These obviously are issues that impact you directly.

So trademark clearinghouse implementation is bucket #1. Discussion around the PIC DRP is bucket #2 and the third bucket is pre-delegation testing. I think these are really the three key issues that we want to talk about today. So why don't we go ahead and just right into it.

The first bucket is trademark clearing house implementation and we have got four issues that we have identified under here. Trademark plus 50 testing, IDN and IDN variants, although the variants could also be a separate heading, and question about the IBM master agreement. So I am going to open it up right now to see if anybody would like to take the lead on any of these four issues.

Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Can I just add a quick fifth which is URS and I will be happy to start off some of these.

On the trademark plus 50, really most of that is not really a registry issue except to the extent that the implementation of that on the front end could delay that actual start of Sunrise and start the launch processes. So the issue here is not about trademark plus 50 as a policy or anything like that, it is really a question about when ICANN come out with the rules - processes and procedures for the trade-maker owners to enter the plus 50 so that we can get everything kind of kicked in.

(Karen Lentz): Thanks, Jeff. So this is Karen Lentz, ICANN staff. The answer to when the rules will be out there? Pretty soon. I have a document that is in the process of being posted now and I believe the board is going to go through in the trademark clearinghouse session tomorrow. For the rules in terms of how would be the right holders go and enter. The additional label will be out there. In terms of the timing for the registry. It is - the functionality should be there before anybody is using operating claims. In other words, the capacity for those labels to be added and the rules for them to have been added is scheduled to be there before anybody operates the claims.

The labels - in terms of implementation, the labels are not treated any differently from a technical perspective than any of the existing labels that are associated with the clearinghouse record and so you put in your mark. The clearinghouse generates matching labels that are associated with that record. What this functionality does is allow a right holder if they have an EDP decision or a court decision indicating that that particular mark that the record has been used or registered abusively according to such and such dominion labels and those can both be verified. Then those labels will be added to the record and have - the same way as other labels that are associated with the record. The only difference being that they can only be eligible for claims service, they won't be part of Sunrise.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think- sorry, this is Jeff. I guess if we look at the timeline that was put up by Christine yesterday, I think it was Sunrise possibly in September and I guess the claims would then possibly be in October. So you don't see any of this as - just to confirm, you don't see any of these rules or any processes to get in the way of an October claims - good- that was for the transcript- no.

(Karen): No.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Jeff and thanks Karen. Thanks for joining us this morning. I appreciate you being here.

Any other questions or comments on the trademark plus 50. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Mine is just a more generic, very brief comment, Keith, to the extent that sometimes I hear that something is going to be implanted in time for us to utilize it, but insofar as possible, we need as we have said before development time ahead of that and a sufficient forewarning as possible so that we have a test environment and, you know, sufficient time for us to get to work with whatever the specification or system is being developed and so it is really just to highlight that buffer between when something is released and when it is expected to go live.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Jonathan. Any other comments or questions on that first topic? If not, let's move to testing.

Man: So a really good segue from Jonathan's last comments, so I have seen some documents go back and forth today including one today that was posted on one of the lists about an SMD standard format or something that just came out, but the real question is when will the registry actually be able to start testing with clearinghouse - with IBM?

Keith Drazek: Is there an update on that?

(Karen Lentz): Yes, thank you. So there are a couple of facets of that I will speak to. First of all, you know, from previous discussions there has been a strong request to have a - one obviously access to a testing environment as early as possible and secondly that it would be sort of generally available indefinitely for - across all of the launches. So that is what is planned and I think you guys may have a session with IBM at some point today with the registrars so I will let them speak to the actual details.

So in terms of testing, there is a test which is called a sandbox test environment but available. Gustavo, is it ready currently or is it almost ready?

(Gustavo): It is almost ready.

(Karen Lentz): Okay. So what the sandbox is - it is for the functionality of uploading with the registered dominion. Correct? And that is kind of an early look at that or opportunity to test that particular functionality. The actual, you know, full production test environment we have as presented by Christine yesterday as August 15th as the date for that.

The other thing that sometimes people ask about - so there is the broad sort of test environment in terms of testing that all of you want to do for your implementation. There is sometimes when people say testing what they mean is, you know, what to I have to go through with the clearinghouse operator to ensure that I am able to operate with them and so something similar to an OT&E process and that is something that is being developed as well and I think that would be useful to have a discussion with (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Karen. Jeff, I see your hand up, but you are right we are meeting with IBM reps this afternoon at 4:30 in our joint session with the registrars just so everybody understands that. Thank you for pointing that out. Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. She said the sandbox will be August 15th or was that two different things? Sorry, I got confused there.

(Karen Lentz): It is two different things. Gustavo's...

(Gustavo): So basically with the (unintelligible) that I sent in the morning you can test most of the functionality for the sound box. The only thing that you are missing is to start testing for the sound box is how load a down file. For that specific interface we have a sound box and we shall send the procedures to access the sound box this week. So basically you will have everything that you need to start testing basically the full (unintelligible). The production provides an environment for the sound box and (unintelligible) . So basically with the (unintelligible) that I sent in the morning that you have most of the things that you need to start testing the sound box. The only thing that you are missing right now is the interface to test the upload of the (unintelligible) file. We are working on that and we should have that sound box ready during this week so you can also start testing that part. So by this week you should be able to test most of the sound box (unintelligible) with the clearinghouse.

Keith Drazek: Good. Thank you. Any follow-up questions? Okay, I don't see any and so thank you very much for that. We have a lot on the agenda here and so let's keep moving through the various topics.

I think we are going to set aside the discussion around IDN and IDN variants for the moment. Let's talk about the IBM master agreement and then URS. So I think one of the questions around the master agreement is that we have seen the scopes of work posted but the governing master agreement has not been posted so I think there was some discussion on our list about wanting to have an opportunity to review that. Would anybody else like to add to that?
Jeff. Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: I mean - aside from the just the master agreement I think one of the things we would like to see is just a document, because it is not in the rights protection mechanism or the requirements and it is not yet at least in the Ts &Cs, I know we are talking about that. So this may be a discussion with the Ts & Cs but what would be really helpful that we need - we understand what the obligations are to ICANN but we don't necessarily understand what the obligations are to the registries and more importantly an operational document. So, for example, who do I call when I have issues? What are the obligations owed to me? How will tickets be responded to? What is the ticketing system like? What is the escalation procedure? Will it be root cause analysis of all of those types of things? That document - there is no information about that.

I actually prefer that to be in the Ts & Cs where those commitments are made. Of course, those commitments would be made by ICANN and then I guess you would be passing through what you get from IBM, but I think that is really kind of the operational document we want to see so I can give that to my engineers and my customer support because if something goes down - if there are problems we need to know what the appropriate resolution would be.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Jeff. Chuck, I saw your hand.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Keith. Chuck Gomes. My comments are a little bit more general but I certainly reinforce what Jeff just said. At a time when the ATRT2 is going on, it has really baffled me why there has been so little transparency with regard to the agreements with IBM and Deloitte. It took literally months just to get the statements of work posted, a partial response, and the only thing I can conclude, and I may be wrong, is that the staff did not do a very good job of negotiating with IBM and Deloitte and consequently you weren't allowed to share some of the information without getting their position. If that is the case, I would surely hope that in future third party agreements that affected contracted parties that you do a better job of negotiating with them and keep

in mind the community you are serving and not just look out for the interests of the third party contractors. Is there a reason why it took so long to even get a partial response to the request for posting this information?

Keith Drazek: Thanks Chuck.

Cyrus Namazi: We don't have anything to add. Thank you for your comments Chuck.

Keith Drazek: Okay, maybe that is something we can follow up on for a more detailed response afterwards. Go ahead Karen. Thanks.

(Karen Lentz): Yes. So in terms of what is posted. You know, the goal in negotiating with them was to, you know, be able to provide as much as we could and so there are along with the full statements of work from IBM there are summaries of both the master agreements with the work with IBM. The - I guess what I was going to respond to you, Jeff, and a little bit Chuck's points on that, is to the extent that there is an item or a piece of that that you feel is missing that is important and needed, then it would be helpful to identify those and we can go back and see if - you know, work with them to provide more on that. Jeff's point about the operational aspect being of concern is helpful so if there are other points like that, then I think we can work with those specifically and then just on the operational - I guess a side comment on how, you know, the operations work in terms of customer support and ticketing. We are working with both Deloitte and IBM because, you know, this is sort of a complex structure where different sets of customers are moving along interacting with three different parties potentially as part of the clearinghouse operation and so each of us has a service desk type of operation and how we coordinate that and make sure that people know where to go. If something is directed to somebody you know how to route it appropriately to the right place. So we are working on coordinating that. In terms of the ICANN site and others are working on a number of tools for the registry interface and support on that. So thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Karen. Any follow-up questions or anything else on this topic before we move on. Okay, next item is URS. Jeff you suggested we put that on so why don't you take this one.

Jeff Neuman: This is going to be for...

((Crosstalk))

Cherie: Excuse me. This is Cherie. A couple of things. One, just a reminder if you would please announce your name before speaking for the benefit of those participating remotely and two, there is a question on chat room?

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Cherie. Would you mind reading the chat question for us? Then we will move to Jeff. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...Will the contract be with ICANN or IBM?

Karen Lentz: So for registries to access the clearinghouse they- sorry, this is Karen Lentz. For registries to access the clearinghouse they will essentially enter into a set of terms and conditions and that is I believe with ICANN the way that we have set that up.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you Karen. Jeff, over to you, URS.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. On the URS there is a document that was posted. I am getting my days mixed up. I want to say maybe last week that called for a standard in communications between the registries and the URS provider. I think it may have covered some other things as well and it was proposed - no it was called a proposed standard and the standard included things, additional requirements like you must send emails in encrypted form via (unintelligible) I may not be saying it right, but my question back to the list.

We are constantly getting documents from ICANN staff, technical staff, with these new “standards” which require additional development and, you know, my question back was a basic, “Why do we need this?” “Why do we need a new standard and what is the intention behind sending at this late date a standard?” So I just wanted to bring up for the group that this is something we need to consider. Some of us may be intending to deal with the URS on a manual basis as opposed to an automated basis because some of our TLDs are going to be so small that building an automated tool to deal with communications with the URS provider just seems to be a lot of time and resources without necessary benefit. So I guess my comment is really that before ICANN publishes, you know, this came without any kind of notice or anything, so before ICANN publishes something that it wants to be a standard, it really should communicate to the registries that this type of thing is coming. Ask whether this should be a standard or not, and from my prospective anything that is proposed in a technical standard should really go through the appropriate standards tract with something like the AITF where that is where standards are kind of made and developed. Otherwise, what I think the important thing really is - that ICANN should be telling us and reminding us what are obligations are as opposed to how we meet those obligations. I think the how question - we love guidelines. I mean if you have guidelines or certain advice on how to do things that is great. That is fantastic, but as opposed to something that you want as a proposed standard that should really go through appropriate kind of mechanisms. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jeff. Gustavo. Go ahead.

(Gustavo): Thank you for letting me for start - (unintelligible) So the DLD document is not standard. It is basically we are just trying to specify how we can meet the requirements from the (unintelligible) to the technical specification that you have in your (unintelligible) system but basically what we have defined and you can do that manually or you can do that automatically. I mean it should work both ways and the thing is we create this document because basically we have questions regarding how URS works. How you can translate those

requirements in the guidebook to something that is meaningful technically from a clinical perspective (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. I appreciate that. This is Jeff again. I appreciate that and I think mainly it was partially the tone because I guess in the documents, you are right, it was we must do this and registrar must do that. So I think if it is intended - if you had posted something like an SAQ document and say hey we have gotten these questions and these are things that we recommend - I even talked to a URS provider last night and had asked them if this is something you know the whole (unintelligible) encrypted email. I asked them was this their requirement or was this something they wanted and they said no and were just as surprised. Then the other question I asked you back, because I understood you were trying to solve or there was a perceived problem that you were trying to solve, and then I asked a question which I still have not gotten a response to, which was is this really a problem. I noted in the UDRP it has never been an issue where an UDRP has been duped by someone trying to pose as an UDRP provider nor has a registrar been duped. My question was I understand that it may be a good idea in theory to do encrypted email for example, but if there is not really a problem yet I am not sure why we need a solution. So, those are the types of things and the reason I ask and the reason - our systems and I am sure most of the other systems are already built for the most part and when you introduce new things we now have to go back to our engineers and say you have to build it this way and, you know, it creates a lot of issues internally.

Keith Drazek: Any other questions or comments on this topic before we move on? Okay, thank you. Alright, so we will move onto the next bucket then which is the discussion around the PIC DRP. I know that there have been ongoing conversations between NTAG, working group members, and ICANN staff and maybe - I don't know if Statton, if you would like to provide a bit of an update around the PIC DRP discussions and then let's try to focus on any specific questions that we have sort of outstanding for ICANN at this point.

Statton Hammock: Sure, Keith. Thanks. Sure thanks. This is Statton Hammock with United TLD. So by way of background, members of the NTAG created a working group to work on a proposal we could give to ICANN to refine and make some proposed changes to the proposed PIC DRP process and so that developed into sort of a negotiating team if you will and we have had some very good exchanges with ICANN staff regarding what we would like to see revised in the currently proposed PIC DRP model process. Chiefly, we are emphasizing that we would like ICANN to own the PIC DRP process essentially. Right now as it is drafted and there is this opportunity for third parties to bring complaints and there is a very elaborate process devised to deal with that and farm that. Sort of adjudication to a third party provider and what we would like ICANN to reconsider is owning that process from a compliance standpoint in terms of being the party bringing the complaint and being the party enforcing whatever the appropriate outcome is of that process. So we had a productive meeting just a few days ago. Currently where things stand is the working group is- I can ask the working group to work on some language that we would like to see revised in the currently proposed DRP process and we are currently working that.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Statton. Thanks to you and that team for all the work that you have put into this. So just to clarify, the next steps are to provide language or still working up the language to provide.

Statton Hammock: Yes. That's right. I had hoped we would get the language over to you, Cyrus, by now but we are still working on it but hopefully we will have something to you later today.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks Statton. Tim Switzer. Go ahead.

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer. So just a quick question. I mean is there general receptivity to this concept as far as coming back with models with the proper language? Is there general agreement from ICANN on this concept?

Keith Drazek: Thanks Tim. Great question. Cyrus, is that something you would like to address.

Cyrus: Actually I will let Krista handle that. This is Cyrus.

Krista Papac: Thanks. This is Krista. Just a point of clarification, Statton, with something you said. That at least my understanding from the conversation we had the other day was that the direct enforcement that you guys were talking about was with respect to Part 3 of the Spec 11 which is the mandatory PICs if you will as opposed to the voluntary PICs which are things that people submitted a couple of months ago? Is that?

Statton Hammock: Well during our conversation we did not distinguish between the voluntary and mandatory PICs. We were just talking about PICs in the general sense.

Krista Papac: Okay. To answer your question directly Tim. It is like all things at ICANN, complicated. We are definitely considering what was discussed in the meeting and we kind of want to see the language and then take that under evaluation and so it is not no. It is let's look at the language and see where we can go from there.

(Cyrus): This is Cyrus. I can add a little bit more to that. I think we are receptive to the outcome of the discussion that we actually had two days ago and by that I mean I think on the ICANN side we are beginning to see the light in the argument that you guys have put forward so that I am very optimistic that once we see your language we will use that as a foundation to find a way out of it that makes both sides happy.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you, Cyrus, very much for that and Krista. Go ahead Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I mean I want to thank our negotiating team for doing that work. I don't know if anyone in the room wants to speak up, but this is really really a critical issue and I just want to get that point across. It is not just a negotiating team

but this is something whether they are a brand, a generic, a IDN, a community, a geo. I mean universally this has been a huge huge issue and in fact to the point where there are a number of registries that said they can't go forward at all if that is not changed.

Cyrus: This is Cyrus. Thank you Jeff. I think I am very sensitive to all the intricate issues that are involved in terms of what we have proposed versus what the concerns are that have come back on the part of the negotiating team on behalf of all of the interested parties and I guess I would reiterate the point that I am very optimistic that we can find a way out of it that would satisfy both sides.

Keith Drazek: Okay. This is Keith. Thanks Jeff. Thanks Cyrus. Chuck, I see your hand.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Keith. Chuck Gomes and I appreciate the receptivity there. There is a lot of emphasis right now on responding to GAC advice and I understand that and I appreciate that, but one item of GAC advice that happened some time ago was that there should not be any material changes to the applicant guide book after applicants apply and the PIC Spec, in particularly the mandatory portion, is a huge material change to what applicants applied for. As it is worded now, it would probably cost registry operators several thousand dollars, probably more like tens of thousands of dollars every time they had to hassle with one of these things that may be frivolous and there is nothing in there right now to prevent that. So I am really glad that the staff is looking at that very seriously because it is a very material change to what applicants applied for. I did not care for it in the voluntary part of the PIC specs that was first proposed but at least applicants had an opportunity to step up to that and see what was there and make a decision. The rest of us who didn't do the voluntary PIC specs, you know, have that hoisted on us which is a huge change and so I certainly encourage a serious look at that and lets make it something that makes sense from a business point of view. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Chuck. Any other comments or questions around PIC DRP before we move on? Okay, I don't see any hands. I don't see any hands in chat and adobe so let's go ahead and move on then. Next bucket is pre-delegation testing. We had an update yesterday evening on pre-delegation testing -Ken. Go ahead.

(Ken): (unintelligible)

Keith Drazek: Okay. I was moving onto the next bucket to see - okay. Okay I am going to open it up. Who wants to talk about pre-delegation testing? Ken.

(Ken Stubbs): I may need some help from the group here because sometimes this issue is - because the technical side is something that becomes a little deep sometimes and so I am going to kind of go over this. You guys have made some proposals regarding some processes. Namely, one of them being the searchable who is where imposing in this pre-delegation testing process a specific who is a searchable and who is process and frankly does not appear to have any real basis in the RFCs and it was never included in any of the requirements that - in the applicant guidebook and there have been discussions about the fact that these requirements were not included in the registry agreement , the guidebook or any RFC. Also, I would like to find out if any of the other registries have concerns about the fact that the specific searchable who is requirements that I can - is requesting in this pre-delegation testing is of concern to them. I mean to me it does not appear to be a strong basis for it. It is kind of like we did not require it as part of the registry agreement and we didn't require it in the guidebook but now we have decided we want it done this way. Am I making sense here?

Keith Drazek: Thanks Ken. I appreciate it. We can open this up to anybody who wants to contribute. Jeff. Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So I can go over for the rest of the group here there were some comments that I made yesterday during the pre-delegation testing session

that there are certain things that the pre-delegation tests, I guess (unintelligible) has made requirements to pass some of their tests that are not, as Ken said, are not specified in the guidebook, in the contract or in a relevant RFC or applicable RFC. Things such as - I know you guys responded to me, but I am just repeating for the rest of the group, but, you know, one of the examples that I pointed out was that the PDT provider had referenced a - in one of our tests - they had referenced that our who is output is not in performance to an XML standard put out by the W3 and they were not willing to pass us at that point because it wasn't in compliance and, you know, my response to that was so what? It is not in the guidebook and not in the contract. There are probably - and Gus and Francisco know this know this because we have gone back and forth, about 150 different emails back and forth, on the number of elements in the testing that aren't in one of those three places and so there is another example where the RFCs actually conflicted with what was in the contract. Now we fixed some of those elements that were in the contract in the last version of the contract, but there are still yet other areas of testing that are subjective. And what we don't have and I noticed one of the items onto here. So we don't have a clear document that outlines the pass-fail criteria on a number of the items.

And I'll give you an example. In the self-certification it asks - you know, and I may be saying this the wrong way. So the technical I hope you understand the gist of what I'm trying to say.

But basically it's a load test result. And what you'd say is this is the expectation of the volume of queries I'll have in my TLD and this is the capacity and the capacity could be 100 times that or 1000 times that or, you know, we don't know what the right answer is.

We don't know that the evaluator's going to go well, your capacity is 1000 queries per whatever and - or sorry, your TLD will be 1000 queries per whatever and your capacity is a million.

Well we don't know going in is that passing? Should it be ten million? Should it be 100 million? There's no criteria that we have, no predictability to know that that type of thing will pass. And it's going to be some subjective determination. And what we're asking for is just some certainty going into the test that what we put in there will pass.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks Jeff. (Ken), I think you had a follow up. Go ahead.

(Ken): Yeah. This kind of ties into the second point here in the second where we're saying we really need your document to clearly define the exact (test space). You want to respond first and I'll come back...

Russell Weinstein: Excuse me. Yeah. Could I interrupt you so maybe because they're two different industries? I don't want to forget here searchable Whois one. So maybe we'll - we can try and answer that one first and then come - would that help or do you want to...

(Ken): No. Because it all ties into the second one.

Russell Weinstein: Okay.

(Ken): So why don't you - do you want to respond to Jeff and I can respond after you. Okay.

Russell Weinstein: Then go ahead and respond. Sorry, this is...

((Crosstalk))

(Ken): Yeah. Well my concern is that your - we really need a clear outline of the criteria required for pass and fail. But more importantly if the criteria that is being - includes issues that such as the searchable Whois requirements that are not included in any of the requirements that are imposed either in the

agreement or in the guidebook, then we need the logic and the understanding and the basis for imposing that criteria.

Coming along and say well, you know, we just think it's a good idea doesn't make a lot of sense because a log of people been building backend infrastructures for 12 to 18 months based on a certain set of assumptions.

All of a sudden now somebody is pulling out and entirely different set of specs and saying well we know it's not been discussed here beforehand but we think it's best and if you don't put - modify them to comply with our specs or our requirements, we're not going to pass you.

So all of a sudden now you got to go back and write code change. All the agreements you might possibly have with people that you're providing registry backend services for or if you were an applicant who has let's say a small technical staff, this could be a major hurdle and could, you know. I just don't see the logic behind that.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Ken). Actually I think that's very clear. Russ), do you want to respond now? Thanks.

Russell Weinstein: Sure. Probably let Francisco take the searchable Whois one.

Francisco Arias: Hi. This is Francisco. So on the searchable Whois I think there are a couple of things that are - just want to clarify that searchable Whois is (only best) for those applicants or (unintelligible) at the time that included that in their application. And therefore it will be included in their Exhibit A (unintelligible) agreement. So it's not that is for everyone. Only those that say they were going to do it.

The other thing as we have mentioned that is this issue of requesting compliance with some things that are not filed for the specification. And we have talked with that about us with the provider and how it's going to fix the

like requirements to compliance with the (W) (unintelligible). Some of that should not be there. Thank you.

Russell Weinstein: And then this is Russ Weinstein again. On the topic related to where we draw the lines and what are the thresholds and things, I think we do need to work through that because providing - just providing data if we don't have a threshold there's no real value to it.

You can just provide anything and say that it's sufficient on your belief. And what's the real point? Why do we even bother asking for it? Seems like a lot of work to go create all those documents if it doesn't mean anything.

So I think we do need to have those conversations. We had some thresholds in mind. We were actually talking about this this morning. Then we get into the catch 22 of if we decide a threshold and we want to, then how do we know it's the right threshold that you guys are comfortable with?

So given the time period, I'm not sure what the right way to have this conversation is. But I think we recognize we need to put in some thresholds into the specs for the things like the self-certifications. And we don't want to make it - we don't want it to be arbitrary but we don't want it to be - create additional failures or anything like that.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Russ. And it sounds like there's an opportunity there for maybe some dialog around a couple of - or a handful of these issues. And to the extent that I think that applicants and backend providers can come up with the specific issues - the specific examples where we're having problems, that would be helpful to you.

So I would suggest that, you know, we, you know, sort of take an action item to work through that but also to have a process in place so applicants can, you know, reach out and contact you and say look, these are the issues that we're having and we need to resolve them.

I saw Jeff and then (Ken). But let's try to keep this - and Chuck. Let's keep this brief.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. And I understand kind of the reluctance or the difficulty in coming out with this. But in the end the tester is going to test it. They're going to make a decision is that sufficient. And so we should know what the tester is going to use or the rationale, the criteria or the - at least the circumstances that they consider. It's weird to go into a test and not know what is going to be tested or how it's going to be evaluated.

The second thing just on the searchable Whois, I think there may be two issues in there or one issue that we didn't cover, which is actually a broader issue and didn't actually surface until some of us did the testing on searchable Whois, which is the notion of technically under searchable Whois you're supposed to get a list of domains on any item that you search including searching by registrar.

And if you search by registrar, you could in theory get the entire customer list of an entire registrar. So the public could go in and say oh, okay, I want to search by GoDaddy and then get the entire list of all of the names that GoDaddy owns per that - for that TLD.

And that is an issue not just for registries but also for registrars. But I understand that, you know, since then - since that discussion what's come back is that you are allowed to put reasonable limits on the results that are returned so as to not have to turn over an entire customer list. So I think that problem's been mitigated.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Jeff. (Ken), did you have one follow up quickly?

(Ken): Yeah. Only just to 30 seconds. Thank you for giving me the clarity there Jeff. My concern is that as we move forward we used to set assumptions for

searchable Whois that existed - that used the existing technologies and RFCs and requirements.

Now all of a sudden somebody else has decided that their definition of searchable Whois includes the set of requirements that isn't necessarily covered in the existing RFCs or in any of the agreements.

So we need to be able to make sure that we don't get into a situation where the guidelines that are given to us are in conflict with what we normally would expect this to be.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks (Ken). Francisco, I saw you wanted to respond and then I've got Chuck in the queue.

Francisco Arias: Thank you (Ken). This is Francisco. So then the - this on searchable Whois is still based on in - it's on Section 1.10 of specification form that's describes for the searchable Whois (sure). Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. Keith and I have received lots of comments from our technical team on this particular issue. Issues keep coming up. EPP commands and commands that are going to be used by a particular registry. There are lots of optional commands in EPP.

But I guess my general observation is I'm amazed at how poorly defined this process is. We're learning as we go and there's always going to be some of that. But this seems to be the main thing that's happening. It wasn't planned that well.

I'd like to think that it wasn't a bad choice of the provider because dot SE has a great reputation. Does that mean then that it hasn't been managed properly or that they were not given the information they needed.

My guess is that if we should have all worked on this together a long time ago instead of trying to do it top down we'd be in a lot better off position right now. So what's happening is we're having to fix it as we go. And that's just a terrible way to do it. We're stuck there now. But I hope we learn from this.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Chuck. Any other questions or comments on this issue before we move on. (Cyrus) has to leave momentarily. So I don't know. Maybe I could just open it up and see if there are any other business that we want to raise before (Cyrus) has to go. I think - Krista, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Krista Papac: Well I wanted to see if you guys had any other business and then I had something I wanted to ask.

Keith Drazek: Okay. So well just one thing and maybe Krista this is what you're going to talk about but if not - (Cyrus) suggested that we try to schedule more regular meetings - more regular interaction between the stakeholder group NTAG and ICANN staff.

So I think something that we'll want to talk about during our stakeholder group business section is, you know, the possibility of possibly inviting ICANN staff to participate in a portion of our biweekly meetings on a regular basis so there's more regular interaction and dialog on various topics.

So I appreciate that suggestion (Cyrus) and I will certainly take that up. I think that's a great idea. Krista, go ahead.

Krista Papac: What you just said. It's Krista. Yeah. I just wanted to open it up or put it out there that I think that a more - some sort of regular discussion whether it's your stakeholder group meeting or a separate meeting that we have but at some regular cadence would be - if it's helpful to you guys, we would, you know, be more than happy to do that.

I feel like the communication's been a little bit broken and maybe that's our fault but I just - I would - I think the open dialog is helpful to everybody. It's definitely helpful to us. And, you know, we want to be able to continue that in whatever way that makes sense.

And so there's two - I think there maybe is even two tracks of dialog. One's with the stakeholder group itself and maybe one's with the NTAG. I'm not sure. But we're looking to you guys to tell us what you need and then we'll figure out how to try and make that happen.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thank you very much Krista. Appreciate that sincerely. Okay. Do we have any other business that we want to raise with ICANN staff before they have to leave us? Anybody in Adobe? Let's see. Yeah. Tim, go right ahead and then Jeff.

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer. Just in advance I want to thank you for your planned participation in the NTAG meeting tomorrow. I appreciate that you're going to be there. I think that'll make the discussion very productive. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Tim. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah I mean before (Cyrus) leaves, I just want to thank him and his team for, you know, making the effort to reach out to us and have this dialog. I think it's really important.

One of the things that I know the organization is still growing. That the GDD organization and one of the things that'll be helpful in the coming weeks is to just understand who specifically at ICANN we refer specific issues to.

So for example if NuStar has an issue with .biz, this is the person, a single point of contact we go to first. Or if it's a new TLD issue, this is the person we go to. So just some - I know it's still all kind of developing. Their staff is

growing but so it'll be fluid. But it would be helpful for the group to just know who is the appropriate person to go to for whichever issue we have.

(Cyrus): So I just wanted to thank you Keith and the stakeholder group for the opportunity for us to be here. I think we had a lot of good dialog. I took a lot of notes. And that indicates to me that I think as you were pointing out Keith and Krista pointed out that we need to have more regular communication so that these issues don't just pop up in, you know, ICANN meetings every three, four, five months or so.

So I'm very much in support of actually setting up an opportunity for us to participate in your get together biweekly I think you mentioned and I'll commit to be there myself so that I can learn from you and we can all feed back to you what it is that we're thinking and to start the communication channel opened up that way so that issues like pre-allegation testing and all these other things that came up are not surprises to us or to you.

In terms of, you know, having ambiguity in terms of who to go to when you have issues, we'll endeavor to actually publish an org chart with levels of responsibilities and growth. But in the meanwhile if there are any questions or any issues, you're definitely welcome to just contact me and I'll commit to make sure that either get you the answer or find the person that has the answer that can get it to your for sure.

So thank you again for having us participate here.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much (Cyrus). I did see two more hands if you have just another minute. Adrian and then we've got another question here.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes. Thanks (Cyrus). Adrian Kinderis from International Domain Registry. Just a follow on from what you said then. I'm not sure whether it's in your plans to do so but to have some sort of welcome kit upon signing and some introductions.

Obviously we're very familiar with the industry but I imagine as you progress you got to be - have new registries joining to have something that explains some of the ICANN world and, you know, contacts, you know, a sort of CRM approach would be beneficial I think. It's been four days and you haven't contacted us yet. I'm worried.

Second one is a drum that you'll be familiar with me beating. And that is the one of internationalization. We posted a letter to ICANN regarding the timing of net gTLD Webinars and the fact that they tend to fall - Mike Palage, you with me? Good. They tend to fall within the U.S. business hours. And we gave examples historically of how lack of time zone variance there had been.

I'm a little frustrated that we didn't get a response at all from that Number 1. And Number 2 if we could take a look at the issue itself and ensure that we are striving for internationalization of ICANN and you'll hear a little bit more about that from me as we continue through the week. Thanks.

(Cyrus):

This is (Cyrus). Thank you Adrian. I did see your letter and I think it's quite legitimate. It does pose some logistical challenges for us in terms of do we actually conduct a Webinar in the middle of the night in Los Angeles or U.S. time or such.

The flipside of it is that we actually record all the Webinars and they're available to people who obviously are not there at a convenient time in the time zone that they are in.

We continue to look for better options to accommodate everyone but being the global organization that we are and all that someone always is going to end up sort of at the short end of the stick so to speak.

But if you have ideas that you think would resolve it well for us, we're all ears. Please let us know. We hear you but I'm not sure if there is an amicable solution to it that at least I'm aware of.

Keith Drazek: Okay. So I'm sorry, (Donna), quick follow up and then we've got one last question before they leave.

(Donna Austin): So (Cyrus), we did provide options in a letter. So we are trying to work with you to, you know, provide some solutions. So I think we wrote this letter almost two months ago now. So some response would be appreciated.

Krista Papac: So, sorry Keith to interrupt. I just wanted to follow up to the first part of Adrian's question or his first question. So Adrian, Krista Papac. How are you doing?

As far as welcome kit goes. So that we're definitely developing that. We will have materials that sort of explain all the things you need to do. And I think that you'll be hearing from us shortly. And as far as you signed your contract moving on to PDT. And for the record, it's only been three days.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Krista. And we have one last question. And please identify yourself for the purposes of the transcript. Thank you.

Woman: Hi Keith. I'm T.H. (RDS) applicant for (Dr. Kira). Question is for staff relating to GAC advice and Spec 11. So will the six-day (unintelligible) set apply to all new gTLDs and the (conconigent) Number 3 in Spec 11? Just wondering what the bar would be for complying with that and if there's plans for staff to define what that bar is or GAC.

I know that the (unintelligible) working group is working on what happens when you fall below that bar but just wondering what that bar is and what the process would be for defining it.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you. Great question. Any response at this point?

(Cyrus): Yeah. This is (Cyrus). I don't know if I have a good answer for you (TH) yet. I'm hoping that we get to that during our discussions that are continuing. Sorry I don't have a better answer for you right now.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Sorry, one more. (Josh).

(Josh): Sort of a quick follow up with regarding to the Category 1 strings. Can ICANN offer any sort of timeline when the Board will have a response to the GAC or next steps?

(Cyrus): So I'm afraid that the Board actually hasn't given us a timeline. It's really driven by the Board itself. So no, I can't really speculate to be hones.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks everybody and thanks very much to (Cyrus) and his team for being here for just over an hour with us. We really appreciate it. So just thank you.

All right. Let's keep moving ahead with our agenda. Next on the list is a update from the NTAG. So over to you Mr. Switzer.

Tim Switzer: Thanks Keith. Tim Switzer. In the interest of time, I mean quite honestly a lot of the very same issues we're talking about here today is what we're going to be focused on. We are having our NTAG meeting tomorrow from 9:00 am to 11:00 am.

What's interesting is I think between the sessions that ICANN has held and the discussions today a lot of the same topics are going to be discussed tomorrow. But I think it will be beneficial to give the chance for all the members of NTAG to have additional input. And again, it'll be good to have the ICANN team there to assist in that.

I would also just take the opportunity to make sure everybody knows that wasn't at some of the sessions yesterday that the Trademark Clearinghouse ICANN meeting that was scheduled for 8:00 am tomorrow morning was moved to 11:00 am. So - and it's now two hours versus one hour. So that'll be right after the NTAG meeting. So other than that, we'll go through all that tomorrow. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks very much Tim. Okay. So we have a break scheduled in five minutes. But there's a couple of other items that we haven't gotten to on our agenda. I think we can fit in at least one if not two more.

I'm actually going to skip down and ask Chuck to give us an update on the IGO-INGO PDP Working Group. I don't think (David)'s on the phone is he or on Adobe? Okay. So Chuck, if you don't mind.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Keith. Chuck Gomes. David MaherDi is our primary registry stakeholder group rep on that. We've both been cooperating together on it. So I'll do my best here.

First of all we need to finish the RySG comments because the comments have to be posted by Keith tomorrow. So I would suggest that we try and do that right now. And after we do that I have one other comment and a general status of what's going on. Okay.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Chuck. So (Paul), you want to take that or (Cherie) and...

(Paul): I second the motion for a vote.

Keith Drazek: All right. So Chuck makes the motion, (Paul) seconds the motion. So let's go ahead and complete the vote on the draft comments on IGO-INGO. (Cherie), if you wouldn't mind. Thank you.

(Cherie): Not at all. For those registries who have not voted it as yet, NeuStar.

Jeff Neuman: Can you just go over very briefly what our position is?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. This is Chuck. And that's coming from the former chair of the drafting team that worked on this. Be glad to Jeff. Our position is basically to support the reservations or protection -- let me word it correctly -- protection of the Red Cross and IOC names according to the list of names - provided by the GAC at the top and second level. Top may not be terribly necessary at this stage but in future rounds it would be if this becomes a consensus policy.

We're also supporting protection for IGO names and by the way, in both cases full names, not acronyms. We're supporting protection of full names of IGOs, again according to a finite list provided by the GAC at the top and second level. Okay.

We are not supporting protection of acronyms in our statement and I'm going to - I'm going to add a new wrinkle that's been added to that but it won't affect our statement. So let me do that after we take care of the vote. Okay. Just got that one yesterday.

And we are not supporting protection for INGO names in any form except for the Red Cross and the IOC (they are INGOs). We're supportive of an exception procedure for organizations that have similar names like Olympic, okay. That's a classic example.

That procedure would have to be developed but, with an exception procedure, so that if there is an organization that has legitimate rights that conflicts with those protected names, there would be a way to pursue that and have that happen.

And we're also supportive of possibly using the Trademark Clearinghouse in a little different form, not just trademarks whereby organizations for example with acronyms could use that. That would require some work but they could

use a mechanism like the Trademark Clearinghouse, maybe just a modification of a clearinghouse, whereby they could use rights protections mechanisms to deal with their acronyms.

And I wish David was here to keep me straight. Certainly if there's anybody else that's in the room that's been a part of that, I didn't come well prepared but I think I covered our statement pretty fully. So any questions Jeff? I'm sorry, what?

Man: What team (and yes) the UPUs, just add that in.

Chuck Gomes: Oh yes. There - we do have - the UPU has voted to oppose our statement. And we do need to decide how we're going to handle that because I haven't been able to get a response from Ricardo whether to include that. Let's deal with that after we deal with the basic vote and then - Ken, did you have a question?

(Ken): Well no. First of all I wanted to thank you guys for managing the effort in the endurance contest there for us. And I do have a comment about how to handle the UPU.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good.

(Ken): But if you would rather - I don't know whether we want to discuss. Yeah. I think they've clearly been asking for a position and we have been at sorts with. At the same point in time I think this is a good chance for us to put a stake in the ground to ensure that minority positions in our common process are represented on an equitable basis.

I think we can get more work done if people understand that even though we may not agree as a body with them, if it turns into a situation where we have 100 different minority comments and we - I think we could deal with that

volume aspect there. But this is clearly olive branch situations and it's probably a good idea to put that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Ken). And for those that may not be familiar with the (RYSG) charter, it clearly calls for including minority statements. Now in this particular case (Ricardo)'s been unavailable so the question I asked him after he submitted that was did he wanted it added as a minority statement or did he want to modify it in any way.

We haven't heard from them so we're going to have to make an executive decision I think and I would just suggest we include the email that he included as a minority statement. If he later wants to in the reply period modify that, he can do that. But we certainly have given him a long opportunity to do that. But I totally agree with you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much Chuck and (Ken). I agree with you as well. I think that's absolutely the appropriate path forward. So what I'm going to suggest actually is rather than taking the vote now is that we defer the actual vote until this afternoon when we talk about the open public comment periods. That gives...

Chuck Gomes: I have a concern about that.

Keith Drazek: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Our afternoon attendance is very different than our morning attendance.

Keith Drazek: All right. (Careful answer). Well said Chuck. All right. So let's go ahead and do it now then unless anybody has any concerns of - and Jeff, did you have anything else you want to say if you...

Jeff Neuman: No. I'm ready to vote. I think I was first to vote. So...

Keith Drazek: All right. Very good.

Jeff Neuman: ...you know, but the only think I - it applies to existing TLDs as well as new.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And keep in mind - I should maybe just give a one-minute background. This is the initial report that the - that there's public comment on right now. Okay. The working group then is going to have to take those comments and try and come up with some final recommendations.

This report that we're commenting on does not provide any final recommendations. But our input would contribute to that and we'll have additional opportunities for input through David and I as well as other opportunities. So yes.

Jeff Neuman: So NuSTAR supports.

(Ken): Keith, I have a point of order real quick.

Keith Drazek: Go ahead (Ken).

(Ken): Just to set a precedent because our next meeting we've got to have 30 people or 40 people that would be asked to vote. Couldn't we just do a motion of those present in the room as to those who approve by and oppose and save having to - this or you just want to go ask each person? Up to you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Ken). I think for today let's go ahead and do the voice vote as we normally do per registry and then we can take that up maybe with the ExCom in terms of process moving forward.

Chuck Gomes: And in quick response to that and Cheri maybe was going to say this. Keep in mind that we - we're really careful about documenting the - who supports it and who doesn't and so forth and so that's helpful to Cherie.

Cherie Stubbs: Thank you Chuck. And we do have two people on Adobe Connect who have not voted yet and I've asked if they're in a position to vote today. So one of those (MuseDome), Cary Karp normally votes with the majority. So I will follow up with him. (PuntCat) is not on the call nor are they present. Employ Media, Ray Fassett on Adobe Connect indicates he's in favor.

(Unintelligible) do we have you in the room? They are not in attendance. (Trailance) normally votes with the majority so (Byron) is not here today nor is he on Adobe. (Unintelligible). .asia (Edmond), are you able to support. Thank you. ICM registry. I do not believe they were attending the meeting nor do I see them on Adobe Connect but they also vote with the majority.

We have someone who's raised their hand in Adobe Connect. Keith, did you...

Keith Drazek: I saw a hand up but now it's not there.

Cherie Stubbs: Okay. And Cary Karp has indicated on Adobe Connect that he is - well, is in favor.

Chuck Gomes: Now I have a question. We have a couple new members that - did I understand that we're going to allow them - I mean I'm fine with that.

Keith Drazek: Yes. So I can go around in alphabetical order. We would have core.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Not voting. That's right. Thank you. Donuts.

(John): Donuts votes yes.

Keith Drazek: Thank you (Jon). Congratulations. That ought to be a memorable one. And International Registry Services. Did I get that right? Just want to say all right, I'm sorry.

Donna Austin: A yes.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: Well while Cherie's tallying there to save time let me jump right in. The GAC and the Board talked about the issue of acronyms. By the way, this is Chuck for the recording there and transcript.

And the Board put forth some options to dealing with acronyms. As some of you know, the Board wasn't real fond of including acronyms. But the GAC has asked for acronym protection. And also the Red Cross has now come back with a broader list of names although they did introduce that sooner to be fair to them. So that may come up later.

But with regard to acronyms and we don't need to talk about this now nor does it affect our statement. But one of the ideas that was thrown out is to not just include acronyms in total but rather possibly include a subset of acronyms that are particularly meaningful as acronyms. Not acronyms for all IGOs. Okay. And the Red Cross & IOC have never really been pushing for the acronym issue.

But anyway, that will come up later. David and I will keep you informed on that. At this point we're not supporting acronyms. We'll bring it back to the group depending on what direction that goes. And obviously that would require some procedure and criteria for doing that. But we'll come back to you on that.

Oh and then last of all before Cherie gives the results, tomorrow there is a session. It's going to be a very participatory session on this issue so it's going

to be four categories of questions that are going to be talked about. And so I encourage all of you to participate in that session if you don't have three or four other conflicts at that time.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks very much Chuck. And echoing (Ken)'s comments, thanks to you and (David) for all your hard work on this topic on our behalf. (Cherie) are you ready? I know changes in math a little bit with regard to the majority and super majority, right, with the addition of the new...

Cherie Stubbs: But we're fine.

Keith Drazek: Go on. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Cherie Stubbs: So the outcome of the vote, 13 support, 1 against, 2 not voted so we have 16 who responded.

Chuck Gomes: And just...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. How did you include CORE because I don't think they would count in - they didn't count in any way in that?.

Cherie Stubbs: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: Do you want me to leave the room?

Chuck Gomes: No, no, no, no.

Man: Yeah (will you) leave please?

Cherie Stubbs: We have for purposes of this vote 16 voting members and that was the result.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thank you very much (Cherie) and thanks everyone.

Cherie Stubbs: Thank you. And I believe we do need to take a little bit of a break right now Keith...

Keith Drazek: Yeah.

Cherie Stubbs: ...for purposes of transcript and recording.

Keith Drazek: Very good. So everybody, we will take a 15-minute break now. So let's please all reconvene at 20 minutes to the hour. Thank you.

Cherie Stubbs: Thank you.

END